

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- APPENDIX

A7693

First appropriations came under the Eisenhower administration and continued funds have been voted by Congress during the Kennedy administration.

Many goodhearted men worked for the dam for many years without thought of doing so to benefit one political party or the other. Their sole aim was to help the future of this area through careful conservation of our God-given resources.

Then the New Frontier moved in. Orders came down from Washington—we don't know for sure whether from Mr. Udall's or Mr. BREEDING's office. The orders were the dinner would be a "Democrat dinner"—no Republican candidates to be allowed to speak.

A high lieutenant of FLOYD BREEDING passed down these orders.

At first the New Frontier wanted the chamber to continue to sponsor the dinner. But the chamber refused to be involved as sponsoring a political dinner for either party. The dinner was taken away from the chamber.

Thus the event planned by the people of Norton County was seized from them and given to one political party for its supposed benefit. The implication was the \$18 million being spent on the dam is totally to aid the New Frontier.

Secretary Udall was originally invited by the people of Norton County. No one cared whether he spoke on political or nonpolitical subjects. But most of us wanted to give both sides a chance to be heard if there was going to be any politics in it.

Instead, Republican candidates were completely barred. Mississippi wouldn't allow a Negro to enroll, and the New Frontier wouldn't let a Republican candidate speak at a community dinner in Norton. It is difficult to distinguish the difference in discrimination.

The reason they don't want any Republican candidates in the limelight is, in effect, "it's our money that you got to build the dam, and we intend to get credit for it."

We'll give the apostles of the New Frontier credit, all right; credit for being the smoothest politicians this Nation has ever seen. They know how to outmaneuver their Republican opponents and how to get the most votes out of every public dollar spent.

The New Frontier has made sure that FLOYD BREEDING has been the "dedication speaker" at new post offices all over the Fifth and Sixth Districts. The Post Office Department has so ordered even when local people would have preferred someone else.

But what they have pulled here at Norton caps them all in disregard for the rights and feelings of local citizens.

Needless to say, the whole mess has been extremely embarrassing to good citizens of this community who freely gave of their time in serving on committees, believing they were working for a nonpartisan effort.

The tactics of the New Frontier in this instance smack of one-party rule of the harshest nature.

We don't exactly expect an apology from Mr. Udall, but this community is at least entitled to an explanation.

Meanwhile we want you to know, Mr. Udall, that the kind of tactics used in the arrangements for the ground breaking events here won't work in Kansas. They might work in the boss-ridden cities of the East. They might work in Massachusetts and they might even work in Arizona.

But if I know anything about the freedom-loving and fairminded peoples of western Kansas, Democrats and Republicans and Independents fed up with infringements on personal liberties, I don't think they are going to fall for it.

The answer will be given at the polls Tuesday, November 6, when the people of western Kansas choose between Mr. BREEDING and the much-slandered-by-the-New-Frontier Congressman from Russell, Mr. BOB DOLE.

May the best man win.

The Honorable H. R. Gross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington Bureau, has written such a splendid article relating to the activities of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

H. R. GROSS is a power of strength in the Congress. Whether you are for him or against him, you must have respect for his courage, tenacity, and knowledge. He is a proven patriot, a good friend, and a worthy adversary.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON, October 12.—There are three parties in the U.S. House of Representatives—Democrat, Republican, and HAROLD ROYCE GROSS. A slight, mild-mannered gentleman from Iowa, Gross is a champion of efficiency and economy in Government.

Although he is nominally a Republican, the first concern of the former editor and broadcaster, who has served in Congress for 14 years, is as guardian of the public pocketbook. He began his political career battling left-handed on the liberal side, but was moved to switch to the right by shock over the free dealing of public funds.

At times he has been a much of a thorn in the side of Republican spenders, when that party ruled Congress, as he has been to the Democratic opposition. Yet he has the respect, admiration, and even envy of Members on both sides of the aisle for his courage and industry, as was evidenced recently when he was honored by almost a hundred colleagues at a breakfast as "the conscience of the House."

Gross, who prefers to be known by his initials, H. R., is the most frequent objector in the House to unanimous-consent requests, by which considerable legislative business and a good deal of monkey business are transacted. With the retirement of 87-year-old Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, at the end of this session for reasons of health, Gross will fight alone on this front of the battle for economy and efficiency. Over the years they teamed up on the economy front.

PREPARES THOROUGHLY FOR ECONOMY WAR

Gross does his homework. He studies every bill. Then, armed with a rule book, he goes to the floor of the House to battle for the taxpayer, poised to leap to his feet, the bird dog of economy. He is the dread of proponents of legislation who rise to speak without preparation. His points of order, parliamentary inquiries, and questions have tied the House in knots, demolished pretentious champions of spending legislation, forced bills back to committee for revision, and frequently knocked them out altogether.

When an attempt was made to pass a bill which was not on the calendar, establishing a \$10 million aquarium and fisheries center by unanimous consent, Gross was on his feet with an objection. This delayed the bill and forced the leadership to bring it to the floor under proper procedure. He saved \$2 million by objecting to a bill which would have erected a memorial to Roger Williams in Rhode Island merely to please former Senator Theodore Francis Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

When Congress sought to appropriate \$500,000 for research on the advisability of adopting the metric system, Gross was there with an objection again. He isn't against the metric system itself. He pointed out that since the decimal system has been adopted by 90 percent of the world, no study is needed. He suggested bringing out a bill which would put the system in effect in about 5 years. He saved taxpayers more than \$600,000 by stopping a move to take over an Arizona trading post.

He has warred on increasing the liquor allowance for ambassadorial entertainment and on junketeering. He charged officials of the Truman administration with "outlandish spending" of taxpayers' money for oil portraits of themselves at \$1,500 each. He objected to providing a military driver for Frank Sinatra and Peter Lawford, brother-in-law of the President, when the entertainers staged a gala on inaugural eve, 1961.

SUGGESTS TIN CUP REPLACE TORCH

When the House voted to give New York City more than \$3 million to reimburse it for the "extraordinary expenses" of its police department during the United Nations visit of Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev, Gross suggested that the Statue of Liberty's torch be replaced with a tin cup. He has suggested every Member of Congress who votes for U.S. purchase of \$100 million of U.N. bonds, buy a \$1,000 bond himself. He has fought official secrecy and waste in civil defense.

While the successes of the Congressman are few, in his own opinion, and mostly temporary and relatively small as measured against the total volume of spending, his daily presence on the floor is a guarantee to taxpayers that nothing is going to slip by unnoticed. He is dedicated in purpose and steers his course by this statement of Calvin Coolidge, which is framed on his office wall:

"Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody."

The Honorable John H. Ray

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join and associate myself with the statements that have been made about the character and service of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN RAY, of New York. The tributes paid to him are most highly deserved. I concur in them completely.

The district he has represented and the Nation he has served have been greatly benefited by Congressman RAY's membership in the House of Representatives.

We shall all miss him. I will particularly feel his absence. My hope is that in his retirement I can still call upon him for counsel as I have so many times during his membership here.

He is a great statesman, combining a keen mind and sound judgment with a willingness to work untriflingly for the good of his country and his neighbors.

As he leaves, I join in saluting him and wishing him and his wife many years of pleasant retirement.

A7694

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 13

How Long Do We Wait for Trade Bans on Cuba?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has been among the leading advocates in the Congress for strong action against Cuba. His work in this regard has been recognized in the press, and I include the following editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Sept. 11, 1962]

How Long Do We Wait?

Florida's Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, in a resolution introduced in the House last week, urged reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine as national policy in the face of the Russian arms buildup in Cuba.

No such reaffirmation should be necessary, but apparently it is.

And merely giving lip service to the Monroe Doctrine is not enough. Failure to implement it will be equivalent to abject surrender to communism.

"Adoption of this resolution," said Representative ROGERS, "will give clear indication to those who administer our foreign policy that the American people want to revitalize this Doctrine, return to our proud heritage, and establish an effective course in dealing with this new threat of communism to the American hemisphere."

Certainly it is obvious that "those who administer our foreign policy" are thinking along lines widely divergent from those of the American people in general. The very fact that communism has been allowed to gain a foothold in Cuba is proof enough of that.

Many of them apparently, subscribe to the prevailing liberal opinion that the Monroe Doctrine is outmoded—that we are committed to action against communism in this hemisphere only in concert with other Latin American States.

The time is past for any such temporizing. It could be fatal.

Even though still unconfirmed by Washington, there is substantial evidence that Russia not only has troops in Cuba, but also intermediate-range ballistic missile bases. There are reports that a Soviet submarine base also is being constructed.

The longer we wait to expel communism from Cuba, the more difficult will be the job. And our liberty is at stake.

[From the Hollywood Sun-Tattler, Oct. 5, 1962]

SUPPORT REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS IN CUBA TRADE BANS

With President Kennedy announcing a decision to order a major economic crack-down on shipping between the Communist bloc and Cuba, special recognition should be given to our Representative in Congress Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, for the part he has played in urging action to check the Soviet arms buildup in Castro's Communist kingdom.

Representative ROGERS has been campaigning for active policies against both the Communist bloc nations and the free world nations which have been shipping to Cuba.

What has aroused Representative ROGERS particularly—and what should arouse every

American citizen—has been the number of ships which have sailed to Cuba after having put into U.S. ports.

This practice has all but made a mockery of the U.S. decision to ban trade with Cuba. What good has it done us to ban trade, then permit ships to come to the United States, take on valuable and vital cargoes and sail happily to Cuba?

And it's also been a mockery of our so-called "assistance" programs to have those free world countries which we've been aiding substantially for years to continue to trade with Cuba—poised as it is like a knife at the jugular vein of American security.

Representative ROGERS' activities have been distinguished by his courage to come out forthrightly and make it clear that we are our own worst enemies by permitting these practices to continue. The Representative from the Sixth Congressional District has called repeatedly for unilateral action by the United States to protect its own vital interests.

He left no doubt in anyone's mind of the gravity of the situation when he said, " * * * The United States is presented with a clear and present threat from the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The weapons, armaments, and personnel now in Cuba add up to a new Soviet offensive in the Western Hemisphere. This offensive is being aided by the 28 free world tankers which ran petroleum products to Cuba in the June-August period."

If these free nations of the world are indeed our friends and allies then we should show no hesitancy in calling upon them—in insisting, in fact—to follow a course of action which is not at complete variance with our national aims and purposes.

Certainly these allies never have been hesitant about calling upon the United States to desist from any actions which they deemed contrary to their security—and the United States has been more than cooperative in adjusting its policies to suit those of anyone and everyone who had a complaint.

It is the height of folly for us to walk timidly for fear of hurting anyone's feelings when our very security is being threatened by a military buildup a scant 90 miles from the shores of Florida.

Moreover, Representative ROGERS has pointed out that assertion of our national interests can bring results. In his remarks before the House Select Committee on Export Control this week he noted:

"Pressures from the Congress have brought results. West Germany, Turkey, and Norway now have announced their willingness to cooperate with the United States. With continued insistence by the Congress and its committees, the policies and actions of this Government will be consistent with the aims of this Nation."

In this regard, however, it must be remembered that the effectiveness of Representative ROGERS' campaign, and the measure of his success, will be determined in great part by the support he receives from his constituents.

Certainly, there is no reasonable individual in this area who is anything but enthusiastic about Representative ROGERS' campaign to curtail shipping to Cuba—but this enthusiasm must be demonstrated if it is to be helpful.

The people of this area should write to Representative ROGERS telling him of their wholehearted support of his efforts, and they should write to as many other Members of Congress as they can, urging these legislators to cooperate with Representative ROGERS in accomplishing what is best for our Nation.

At the same time that we commend Representative ROGERS for what he is doing, let us also give him our full support in every way that we can.

In Defense of Eagles**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 the House cleared for the President a bill to provide protection for the golden eagle. There have been many vividly written stories about the so-called strength of these birds but the veracity of such tales is open to question.

My good friend, Mr. Lewis Wayne Walker, associate director of the world-famous Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum near Tucson, Ariz., has written an incisive study of this issue which I would like to share with my colleagues:

HEADLINES ON EAGLES

(By Lewis Wayne Walker)

Since the dawn of history eagles have been described as culprits that carry off babies, sheep, deer, and goats and a variety of other victims. Even today, when we are supposed to be so scientific and so reasoning, such stories crop up periodically in our newspapers. The following news dispatch from Seattle, Wash., is a typical masterpiece of reportorial romancing. It has action, suspense, and in fact everything a story should have to make good "copy"—except, of course, the truth.

"A shadow circled high overhead, the child lay on its back and watched it interestedly," reads the news story. "The shadow narrowed its circle flying in a narrowed spot in the sun. Suddenly it swooped down with a terrifying whirl of strong wings, glistening black in the sunlight. The child screamed. Cries terrible and pained filled the air."

From the town of Gunpowder, Md., comes another. This one was headed by a picture that was captioned: "Bird Weighed 50 Pounds; Had a 6-Foot Wingspread." It would be interesting to have a reliable airplane designer specify the horsepower needed to lift such a weight. But the story goes on:

"Attacked by two immense eagles as she played in the yard of her home here, 3-year-old Betty Earnestburger was saved from possible death, or even from being carried away, when a friend of her parents fired on the huge birds."

And then from another publication: "The Meece boys and the Phelps boys were startled by a scream. Eight-year-old Jim Meece had run a short distance away from his brothers. A great, bald eagle had swooped down from the sky and fastened its talons in little Jim's leg. For perhaps 2 seconds there was a struggle, Jim fought wildly and cried out. The bird succeeded in lifting him from the ground, his head hanging down. The struggle continued as the eagle flew to a height, according to the estimate of the other children, of about 75 feet. Jim kicked out violently. The eagle flew lower. The boys on the ground screamed too. And at last the bird released its grip and Jim fell. It had flown a distance of 200 feet. There were bruises on Jim's legs from the grasp of the talons and bruises and cuts on his body from the fall at a height of about 12 feet, but otherwise he was sound and whole. Jim weighs only 35 pounds. If he had been a little lighter, the eagle might have succeeded in carrying him away."

A Look at Communism and Cuba**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world views the situation in Cuba with great trepidation and concern. It must be recognized that the Castro government is a Western Hemisphere foothold of international communism.

A number of leading Americans have spoken out on this subject. One of them is George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., former business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, passed Imperial Potentate, AAOONS and a director of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

His address "A Look at Communism and Cuba" was delivered before the New York Kiwanis Club on October 10, 1962. I ask unanimous consent to place this address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

A LOOK AT COMMUNISM AND CUBA

Officers, members and distinguished guests of the Kiwanis Club of New York City, thank you for the privilege of speaking to you today on the subject that is worrying all liberty loving people—communism.

Some primitive societies practice a limited brand of communism. Tribes lived in common and shared property, food and housing. The principle of communism is, therefore, not new.

Modern-day communism, known as the "science of Marxism-Leninism" is about a century old and made little progress during the first 60 years. Communism as we know it today had its beginning largely in the mind of Karl Marx. May I briefly refresh your memory of his background?

Marx was born in Trier, Germany in 1818, son of a prosperous lawyer. He was an intelligent but temperamental child. His school marks were superior. He made arrogant statements and wrote satirical verse. He was smart, vain, bitter and rebellious.

He did not have a job at graduation and didn't seem to care. A lifelong trait. He preferred to dabble in atheism and socialism.

Marx had hoped to teach but drifted into journalism. He wrote acidly, pouring ridicule on everything and everybody with whom he disagreed, strongly influenced by the teachings of Ludwig Feuerbach, a German philosopher who preached materialism.

Marx, an atheist, called for war against religion, a war that to this day is the Communist cornerstone and philosophy. In 1842 he became editor of a leftwing Cologne newspaper and undertook a bitter tirade against the Prussian Government. The paper was suppressed and Marx went to France. In 1849 he went to England with his family.

Frederick Engels, a fellow German, living in England became his intellectual comrade, his financial supporter and his faithful champion. Engels was from a wealthy family.

He is most appropriately called a "collaborator" of Marx. He had an encyclopedic memory and his farflung interest and knowledge of industrial techniques equipped him to supply Marx with important information. He also wrote independently of Marx and, in some instances, under Marx's name. Together Engels and Marx conceived and formulated the doctrine of communism.

Engels spent much of his time in Man-

chester, England managing his father's textile business. Marx lived in London. Engels lived out of wedlock and when his common-law wife died he lived with her sister for years. He finally consented to marry her shortly before her death.

Marx lived in poverty. He suffered from boils, headaches and rheumatism. His wife's health was poor. Her seventh child was born dead. "Daily my wife tells me," wrote Marx, "she wishes she was lying in the grave with the children. And, I can't blame her."

Marx depended on pittances for his living, especially from Engels. He lived from pawnshop to pawnshop. It is a bitter irony of history, that the founder of communism should have been literally kept alive by a wealthy industrialist. Engels, a "capitalist's" son turned Communist was cofounder of this revolutionary movement.

It was in the minds and hearts of such characters as Engels and Marx that communism was conceived.

**RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA—COMMUNIST
GOVERNMENT**

Understanding the nature, objectives and philosophy of communism, Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover refused to recognize the Communist Government of Russia.

In his letter to the President of the All Union Central Executive Committee of Moscow, dated October 4, 1933, President Roosevelt opened the door to the recognition of the Communist Government. Mr. Roosevelt said, "Since the beginning of my administration (he had been in office about 6 months), I have contemplated a desirability of an effort to end the present abnormal relations between the 125 million people of the United States and the 150 million people of Russia." If you are of similar mind, I should be glad to receive any representatives you may designate to explore with me personally all questions outstanding between our countries.

On October 17, seven days later, the Communist President replied in part as follows: "I am glad to accept your proposal to send to the United States the representatives of the Soviet Government to discuss with you the question of interest to our countries. The Soviet Union will be represented by M. M. Litvinov, the peoples commissar of foreign affairs, who will come to Washington at a time to be mutually agreed upon."

A few days later, Mr. Roosevelt recognized the Communist Government of Russia.

In 1933, Hitler became the target of Soviet Russia. The Bolsheviks, fearing German military power, attempted to enlist the support of the non-Communist world to combat fascism.

Russia joined the League of Nations and became a strong supporter of the collective security program aimed at holding Hitler in check. Fascism, shouted the Communists, represents a danger to everybody, Communists and non-Communists. All must work together to destroy Hitler's fascism.

In August 1939, the entire world was shocked to learn that Hitler and Stalin had signed a nonaggression pact. Here was Moscow making an agreement with that Fascist beast Hitler, whom it had denounced several months sooner in the bitterest terms. Hitler and Stalin made a deal. German forces invaded Poland from the West and the Russians from the east. Russia and Germany annexed large slices of Polish territory.

The Soviets became the "defenders of the peace" and everyone, except Stalin and Hitler, were "imperial warmongers." Hitler, the former enemy, now a friend and ally.

The war between Germany and the Western Allies was termed by the Communists the "imperialist" war. There was Communist opposition in our country to lend-lease, the draft, and military production; the Communists advocated strikes and circulation of

antiwar literature. "The Yanks are not coming," was the Communist slogan. Pickets marched around the White House 24 hours a day urging the United States to stay out of the European war. On June 21, 1941, the pickets were withdrawn. A change in tactics was eminent. Strikes stopped. Reason: After his nonaggression pact with Stalin, Hitler became deeply engaged in a war on his western front on learning that Stalin was ready to strike him in the back.

Hitler attacked Russia before Stalin had an opportunity to strike Germany. The European conflict, now said the Communists, is a "patriotic war," a "peoples' war." The United States must get into the war at once, must give support to Russia, war material, money, and manpower. United States must help keep Russia from being overrun by Stalin's "friend," Hitler. A virtual nightmare gripped the Communists who pleaded for lend-lease and second front. Send relief to Russia was the cry.

In 1943 Moscow dissolved the Comintern. The purpose was to mollify the Western fear and distrust of communism. In 1944, the Communist Party in the United States of America was "dissolved." Actually, it merely changed its name to CPA, a "political educational association."

In 1945, the war over, Hitler defeated, Moscow reverted to its former hostile "line." She denounced the Allies and claimed full credit for destroying Hitler and the Japs too, even though they entered that war 5 days before the Japs surrendered.

Communism has made its greatest progress since recognition by this country in 1933. At the time Mr. Roosevelt recognized the Communist Government of Russia it was practically bankrupt.

Many people are today concerned about the welfare of our country and the preservation of our way of life. Millions are asking, "Can capitalism and communism co-exist in the same world?"

The founders of communism told us they cannot. Their successors by act and deed have confirmed it.

"I cannot forecast the action of Soviet Russia," said Winston Churchill in 1939. "It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside of an enigma."

Let us now discuss Cuba for a few minutes.

In his campaign for the Presidency 2 years ago Senator John F. Kennedy used as his theme, "The Decline of American Safety and Prestige." Candidate Kennedy pointed to the rise of Castro in Cuba as evidence that, "our security and our leadership are both slipping away." His Cuban policy was to "let the Cuban people know our determination that they will some day again be free * * * to let Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer * * * to let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere * * * and especially to end the harassment * * * of liberty loving Cuban forces in Cuba and in other lands.

"Thus far," Candidate Kennedy said, "these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government" and, "the way to put the ideals of the American Revolution into significance is to act on them, not to talk about them." Hopefully he said, "events may once again bring us an opportunity to act on behalf of the cause of freedom in Cuba."

Events did bring President Kennedy this opportunity. It was on April 16, 1961, which he muffed.

May I now read excerpts from an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report on September 17, 1962 entitled, "The Inside Story—Kennedy's Fateful Decision: The Night the Reds Clinched Cuba," which appeared in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"A fateful decision," made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961 is rising now to plague the United States.

On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion. Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B-26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force. A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's plans and to provide air support for the invasion. Secure in this assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the preinvasion planning. Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B-26s was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away, waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots. But those planes didn't take off.

That was the fateful decision President Kennedy made on that Sunday evening. He decided that the anti-Castro Cubans could not have the support of their own air force during the invasion. Without that support, the invasion failed. When the invasion began, in the predawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the nonmilitary officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used in fly air support for the invaders.

Two U.S. carriers, their decks loaded with fighting planes were standing by not far away throughout the entire invasion. Their planes were readily available. In the planning of the invasion (planning begun under the Eisenhower administration), the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of U.S. air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and nonmilitary men joined in renewing the plea. Another "No." Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said, "No" in the use of U.S. planes. On the beaches, in the Bay of Pigs, the invaders fought on. They did not know that an American President in Washington, 1,400 miles away, was in tight control of their every military move. They were not aware that President Kennedy had taken away their air cover.

With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble. Castro brought up the few planes he had left.

Castro jets—made in America—bombed and sank two of the five ships of the invasion fleet. One carried most of the invaders reserves of ammunition. The other was their communications center. Castro tanks, safe from attack by air, moved into effective action.

In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first? Finally, an air strike was set up early Wednesday.

On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate. The invaders fighting without air support, were driven back under pressure at Castro's superior numbers. By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy.

On this night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier plane for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes still were not to attack land targets. Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communication mixups. The Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got this action. And anyway, it developed it was too late. By sundown of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives and Castro is demanding \$62 million for their release.

In his press conference on September 13, 1962, President Kennedy had no kind words for those who are saying today what Candidate Kennedy said during his campaign for the Presidency. In addressing himself to the military aspect of the Cuban situation, Candidate Kennedy said, "I think Castro is a source of maximum danger . . . a Communist menace has been permitted to arise under our very noses, only 90 miles from our shores. [Castro's] Transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations . . . by jet planes, missiles or submarines . . . is an incredible dangerous development." Candidate Kennedy warned, "The whole Western Hemisphere's security system is drastically threatened." President Kennedy referring to Soviet shipments of arms and men to Cuba, said that these "do not constitute a serious threat to any part of this hemisphere." He strongly denied that Communist buildup is such as "to endanger or interfere with our security," or that Cuba is "an offensive military base of significant capacity." That is what Khrushchev and Castro are saying and the President says he believes them.

Today, Castro's Cuba is still 90 miles off our shore, has the second strongest ground army in our hemisphere, has received, since the failure of the invasion in April of 1961, over \$175 million in military aid and supplies from Communist-bloc countries. Communist-made jets, jeeps, tanks, radar, and electronic equipment are arriving daily in Cuba's harbors. Our State Department reports 4,500 Russian sailors and technicians are in Cuba helping Castro. They are training new pilots, ground crews, and artillerymen.

The military capacity of Cuba is vastly larger now than it was when Candidate Kennedy became President Kennedy.

As part of his propaganda for the election to the Presidency, Candidate Kennedy wrote or had written for him a book, "Profiles of Courage" in which he indirectly compared himself with the great leaders of our Republic. Men, whose wisdom and courage did much to make ours a great country. "Profiles of Courage," leads one to believe that not only did Candidate Kennedy possess the wisdom and courage of our Founding Fathers, but we could expect from him in the event of his election to the Presidency, the same kind of wisdom and courageous

leadership which they provided. Up to now, he has evidenced indecision and he has frequently been the picture of retreat.

President Kennedy with the aid of the FBI licked the steel companies, and with the aid of Federal troops he licked the Governor of Mississippi and put General Walker in a mental institution, but he does not have courage enough to take on Castro or to stand up to Khrushchev.

Report on the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress has finally spoken to a halt and I wish to express my sincere thanks to the citizens of the 12th District of New Jersey for affording me the high privilege of representing them in the U.S. Congress. As part of the responsibility of my office, I make this report to my constituents on some of our accomplishments and failures.

The first session adjourned on September 27, 1961, which made it the longest since 1951. But even this was topped by the second, just now completed. It must be remembered that for the first time since 1954, one party was placed in control of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and one could reasonably suppose that any program advocated by the administration would have been enacted into law. But such did not prove to be the case.

The duties of a Representative—usually referred to as a Congressman—divided themselves into three major categories, the first of which is to legislate by exercising considered judgment to determine those bills that are for the best interests of his district and country. The second, to serve constituents who have particular problems, including matters pertaining to the military, immigration, social security, and others which are of vital personal importance to many residents. Third, and a very important one, is to receive the opinions and views from constituents on legislation and administrative matters as a guide to grassroots thinking.

I have kept my sights on the diligent effort to accept all three of these responsibilities and I am proud of the fact that my attendance record and participation in both committee meetings and House sessions has been extremely high and on a full-time basis.

In the third category, I have been favored by an abundance of thoughtful mail opinion on many subjects, and this has been very helpful.

Additionally, in this session I afforded my constituents the opportunity of expressing their views on 12 important subjects through a questionnaire mailed to them. There was a 19.4-percent return on the questionnaire, and this is a most impressive commentary on the interest

1962

Blockade Cuba**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, among the leading advocates in the Congress for strong action against Cuba, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has received press recognition for his efforts. I include the following editorials in the Record:

[From the Fort Myers News-Press, Sept. 22, 1962]

A BLOCKADE THAT'S NOT A BLOCKADE

The most sensible proposal made to date in the hullabaloo over how to deal with Cuba comes from Representative PAUL G. ROGERS. The action he proposes would amount in effect to a blockade but would not be one in fact, with all the incalculable consequences that such an "act of war" could have.

From many quarters demands have been made that the administration impose a blockade on Cuba, which is nonsensical. A blockade is a step which a belligerent takes in wartime. If we were to declare one against Cuba it would amount to declaring war on Cuba, and if we are to make war on Cuba we should go all out on it. In any other circumstances a blockade would be merely one of those halfway measures that the advocates of vigorous action decry. But we are scarcely prepared to make war on our neighbor.

A blockade would mean we would have to halt any ships, those of the Communist nations or those of our friends, which refused to recognize it. We would have to stop them with our warships or warplanes, and sink them if necessary—a sure way to lose friends and start a war, a war that Castro isn't worth. Furthermore we would invite the Russians to declare a similar blockade in other waters to stop our shipments to allies such as Turkey.

Under ROGERS' proposal we could achieve the results of a blockade without incurring these dangerous risks. The Communist supplies, both military and nonmilitary which are being poured into Cuba are being taken there principally by ships of our allies, notably West Germany, Greece, and Italy. After delivering their Communist cargoes to Cuba these ships come to U.S. ports to load American goods for their return voyage, since Cuba has nothing to export and it would not be profitable for these ships to return empty. ROGERS would stop this shipping by banning the use of American ports to any ships which take goods to Cuba and banning the shipment of American goods in such vessels. He also would invoke against the countries which own these ships the provision of the Mutual Security Act which bars U.S. aid to any country which aids Castro.

The administration must consider it important to stop this shipping because it has made mild diplomatic representations to the other countries about it. These polite expressions of our concern have been shrugged off by the other nations. Now the situation calls for stronger measures and the Rogers program points the way for them.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL ROGERS SEEKS BAN ON CUBAN IMPORTS

Hats off to Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS for introducing a resolution Wednesday call-

ing on the President to halt all imports into this country from Cuba.

The Rogers measure, in the form of a House concurrent resolution, would express to the President the will of the Congress that he act under the existing laws of the United States to stop Cuban imports which continue to flow into this country.

Rogers and other Members of Congress have for more than a year urged the State Department to take action on Cuban imports and have received, with each request, the answer that the matter is under consideration.

The U.S. State Department just this month issued a white paper entitled "Cuba," which stated in part:

"The present situation in Cuba confronts the Western Hemisphere and the inter-American system with a grave and urgent challenge * * * the challenge results from the fact that the leaders of the revolutionary regime betrayed their own revolution, delivered that revolution into the hands of powers alien to the hemisphere, and transformed it into an instrument employed with calculated effect to suppress the rekindled hopes of the Cuban people for democracy and to intervene in the internal affairs of other American Republics * * * it is the considered judgment of the Government of the United States of America that the Castro regime in Cuba offers a clear and present danger to authentic and autonomous revolution of the Americas—to the whole hope of spreading political liberty, economic development, and social progress through all the Republics of the hemisphere."

"But while our Government sees the 'clear and present danger' from Castro to the entire Western Hemisphere, has stopped U.S. exports to Cuba and has broken off diplomatic relations with the Castro government, we continue to allow Cuban products to be shipped into this country and thus supply Castro with over 60 million U.S. dollars a year to continue domination of the Cuban people and plan the spread of the cancer they have planted in the middle of the Americas," Congressman ROGERS said.

Congressman ROGERS pointed out that the United States has always met the threat of communism throughout the world and has just demonstrated in the case of Laos that we will do so there promptly and firmly as our security and the security of the free world is threatened. But in the case of Cuba just 90 miles from the beaches of Florida, we have only met the threat half way.

ROGERS stated that this matter has "been under consideration" since the proclamation of October 1960, banning our exports to Cuba. The State Department White Paper, Cuba, has stated "A series of trade and financial agreements has integrated the Cuban economy with that of the Communist world."

Surely it is past time for action in banning Cuban imports into the United States.

With communism practically in our backyard it's time the President took a firm stand against Castro and cut off the millions of U.S. dollars we are contributing through Cuban imports, thereby providing Castro with funds to carry on his ruthless campaign against American democracy.

The only reasoning there can be for the President's soft-handed approach to Cuba is that he is waiting for the Cubans to wipe out Castro and his cutthroat henchmen through a revolution. But the period of waiting is taking too long. The Cubans who want to revolt cannot go against Castro's armies with picks and shovels. They will need help in the form of arms from the Americans.

Even if it is necessary to provide arms through the back door (some South American country opposing Castro) we should make this help available immediately.

UNESCO and U.S. Policy**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 through 13 the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO held its 22d meeting in the Penn-Sheraton Hotel in Pittsburgh. This was the first time in its 16-year history that the commission has met in Pittsburgh.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record and to include extraneous material, I include speeches made at this meeting by Hon. Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and Hon. Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

UNESCO AND U.S. POLICY

(Address by the Honorable Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, at the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO Meeting, Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 12, 1962)

This is the first time I have had the opportunity formally to address the National Commission for UNESCO since I briefly met with you at your last session. I welcome this opportunity to meet with you again.

Over the years, this commission has made significant contributions to shaping our role in UNESCO, including our position for the important General Conference which opens in Paris next month. I want to take this opportunity to thank you very sincerely for the constructive suggestions and advice which you have given us; to report to you on the steps we in the Government have taken since your last meeting; and to discuss with you the general line we plan to take at the General Conference. I can assure you that we are going to Paris conscious more than ever of the vital mission UNESCO can play in the world today and of the continued leadership the United States must exert in that Organization.

UNESCO today faces unprecedented challenges. The newly developing countries need massive programs of education and training to develop their human resources. This need was implicit in the resolution unanimously adopted by the U.N. General Assembly last year designating the 1960's as the U.N. development decade. Indeed, it was the President of the United States who prompted this joint pledge to wipe out mankind's present plagues—poverty, ignorance, and disease.

UNESCO should play a crucial role in this most promising project. We would all agree that a country can develop and progress only as fast and effectively as it can build its human resources through education and training. This highly significant conclusion—that people provide the prime ingredient for progress—was pointed up at UNESCO meetings in Addis Ababa, Tokyo, and Santiago during the last year and a half. The historic declaration adopted at Santiago last March emphasized that the next decade will be a crucial period in Latin America in that it will decide whether or not an anticipated 300 million people will or will not be able to obtain higher living standards and enjoy the benefits of technical and cultural standards "under liberty

and the institutions of representative democracy." Similar declarations emerged from the deliberations at Addis Ababa and Tokyo.

UNESCO must be responsive to these new needs; but to accomplish its mission in the years ahead, the Organization must redirect its program along lines that contribute directly to the objectives of the development decade.

On the basis of a careful study of UNESCO's proposed program and budget for 1963-64 (and I might add that we in the Department of State are trying to make a more careful study of the programs and budgets of all the specialized agencies of the U.N. than we have done in the past), we have found that sufficient recognition has not been given to the kind of redirection we have in mind. The proposed program does not, for example, sufficiently recognize the vital educational needs of the development decade, nor does it, for that matter, adequately reflect the mandate of the 11th general conference to give top priority to education. The proposed budget would extend the general level of increases in education and related programs to almost all phases of the UNESCO operation, with the result that the existing proliferation of UNESCO activities would be continued. In this connection, you will recall that in your report on your April meeting you stated that "there was a consensus that UNESCO should establish priorities among its manifold activities and work toward a greater concentration of effort in a more limited number of fields in which it is uniquely qualified to render service, rather than permitting its resources to be spread too thinly over a multitude of proliferating projects." I heartily endorse this view.

We all recognize, of course, that the UNESCO program must grow. The question is, how and in what direction? We do not accept the principle that such growth must be across the board. Moreover, we feel very keenly that the rate of growth must not exceed the management capabilities of UNESCO and that the budget increase must not be so high as to impose unreasonable demands on member states.

In applying to the proposed budget the criteria which I have just mentioned, the Department has come to the conclusion that the UNESCO budget level for 1963-64 should provide for an increase of \$5.5 million or 17 percent over the 1961-62 biennium. Such an increase would result in a budget level of \$38 million for the next biennium instead of the budget of \$40.884 million proposed by the acting director-general. The \$38 million level would, in our view, permit the organization to carry out all ongoing and new programs which in our judgment are necessary and desirable.

Inasmuch as the budget level proposed by the United States would require some curtailment of program items of lesser or marginal usefulness, we recommended at the executive board meeting that the Acting Director General reexamine the budget with a view to eliminating or cutting back such activities; and that he be asked to revise the program within a \$38 million ceiling. As a matter of general guidance in connection with such reexamination, we suggested that a close examination be made of the following areas where, in our view, substantial cutbacks could be made without sacrificing any of the essential elements of the program.

First, we believe UNESCO should hold fewer meetings and restrict these to topics of genuine importance. The proposed program of UNESCO calls for 125 meetings at a cost exceeding \$3 million. Fewer meetings would give the Secretariat and member governments more time to prepare for them and adequately to assess the results.

Second, we consider that the time has come for UNESCO to determine whether the nongovernmental organizations which it has subsidized for many years can—at least in

some instances—become self-sustaining; and whether or not UNESCO support, if necessary, might take the form of contracts for specific services instead of general subsidies. While there is no question of the usefulness of most of these organizations, it is significant to point out that the drain on UNESCO for this type of support has now risen to \$1.5 million, and unless alternative ways are found to put these organizations on a more self-sustaining basis, they will never achieve the independent status which we consider desirable.

Third, while we were pleased to note that the acting director general has placed time limits on support of regional institutes and centers, we believe that UNESCO should, in most cases, try to phase out its support at dates earlier than those proposed by the acting director general. UNESCO's proper role with respect to such centers and institutes is to provide initial financial support, based on the assumption that if the project is worthwhile and of value to member states, the states receiving the service will eventually assume full responsibility for its support. If the centers and institutes do not develop to the point of obvious usefulness to the states in question, it is fair to conclude they should be phased out.

Fourth, in our opinion some activities of UNESCO fall more properly within the scope of other agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, and the International Labor Organization. Similarly, there may be activities of these organizations which fall within the purview of UNESCO. Shifting these activities to where they belong should eliminate undesirable competition and duplication of efforts, and should produce some savings.

Fifth, we consider that UNESCO should abandon activities such as youth conferences, tendentious publications, and those seminars which lead to polemics rather than scholarly results. The question is not only one of cost, but one of integrity, for UNESCO's standards of scholarship, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion. A special committee of your Commission has been working on the difficult problem of what the UNESCO publications policy should be, and their views, I am sure, will be most useful in our efforts to help UNESCO establish a sounder policy in this field.

In suggesting that UNESCO endeavor to tighten up its programs, our objective is to try to help UNESCO become a sounder, more effective, and even more helpful organization than it has been in the past.

The U.S. position, as I have outlined it, found immediate and wholehearted support from the United Kingdom and New Zealand, both of which had gone through a somewhat similar exercise and had come to about the same conclusions. As a result of this support, and the support of like-minded delegations, it was possible to get through the executive board a resolution to the general conference along the lines of the U.S. position.

Although the margin of victory was slim, the U.S. delegation viewed the executive board action as highly significant in that it marked one of the first indications of a disposition on the part of the executive board to exert itself as a true policymaking body in the field of program and budget.

Much remains to be done if we are to have the general conference approve our overall position on the program and budget. We hope for the support of other governments for a \$38 million budget ceiling and the needed program revisions I have outlined. Also, we are hopeful that some of the marginal activities of the organization will be eliminated or curtailed in revisions which the acting director general has been requested by the executive board to propose and submit to the general conference.

As you know, a new director general will be elected by the general conference next month. The present acting director general, Rene Maheu, of France, has received the nomination of the executive board. Whoever the choice of the general conference may be, the new director general must and will receive the full support of the United States in facing the arduous tasks ahead. I would like in the final few minutes to highlight what I believe some of these tasks to be.

The first and foremost challenge is the need for educational development which, as I have said, is at the heart of the development decade. We should have no doubt about the scale of the need. One African country alone has estimated that it will need 20,000 teachers to achieve primary universal education during the next 20 years, a goal set by the African countries themselves at the Addis Ababa Conference last year. The Asian countries have estimated that they will need to train 8 million new teachers by 1980. These needs can be met only by a concerted international effort.

UNESCO must face up to the implications of the expanding frontier of science in other areas. Among the prospects held out to us by scientists are new sources of water, power, and natural resources; desalinization of ocean water; reclaiming the deserts; exploring systematically the character of the oceans; studying ways in which their potential can be more fully utilized for the benefit of mankind; harnessing solar energy for power; early earthquake detection; and the enormous problem of providing water for growing populations. All such research henceforth will be unthinkable without international cooperation, for such research covering vast stretches of land, the ocean, or outer space also affect the livelihood of people across boundaries and are in many cases too costly for any one country to undertake.

In this short discussion, I have tried to review with you our interests in UNESCO and our objectives at the coming general conference to make UNESCO an ever more vital force for man's improvement, today and also tomorrow. Indeed, it is not too early to start thinking of priorities and concrete proposals for the general conferences of 1964 and 1966. In our concern for the immediate, we must not ignore the long-range in the planning of UNESCO's program. In conclusion, let me assure you again of the faith of your Government in UNESCO and of the strong support it is determined to give to the improvement and revitalization of these programs in whose behalf you are giving so unsparingly of your own efforts.

HIGH HOPES AND A HARD LOOK

(Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the 22d meeting of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO at the Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., Oct. 12, 1962)

This morning you heard some plain words from Luke Battle about the hard facts of financing UNESCO. I think my colleague has made it clear that the United Nations, Economic, Scientific and Cultural Organization is not unloved and will not be undone by the U.S. Government. We consider UNESCO a priceless and irreplaceable organization—that is why we are determined that it shall not become a catchall agency, a refuge for dilettantism, a repository for the tag ends of operations of other agencies—or as Kipling said, "a sort of a bloomin' cosmopolouse."

To some, however, the U.S. intention to hold down the proliferation of UNESCO activities, and concentrate especially on its education program, may sound tightfisted or even negative. It is tightfisted. But it is also an affirmative approach, consistent

ressional District for electing me—and electing me so many times.

I write this, therefore, with a deep feeling of appreciation and some nostalgia. As you know, I am relinquishing my seat in Congress to run for the U.S. Senate. I aspire to the 4-year term of the late Senator Henry Dworshak. It would be a privilege and a pleasure to serve all of the people of Idaho from this wider sphere.

Our Friends Are at Sea: Aiding Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Congress and the American people are encouraged by the actions of many friendly nations in stopping shipping to Communist Cuba.

While the list of countries which stand with us grows, we all continue to wonder at the actions of our formerly staunch ally, Great Britain.

Editor Don Shoemaker, of the Miami Herald, in an editorial for October 11, points out that Cuba must be supplied with ships—and Britain is providing these ships.

Mr. Shoemaker points out:

When there are no ships handy, the jig is up. Castro then has been isolated economically.

We have been very successful in getting true friends of the United States to cooperate with us to economically blockade Cuba. As the editorial indicates, Great Britain has reason to remember our actions when she was threatened—and should act accordingly.

I include this editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FRIENDS ARE AT SEA

Has the United States the right to request its European allies not to provide ships for Russian trade with Cuba, and then exact mild penalties if they don't cooperate?

We think so. And some of them agree.

West German ships carry 12 percent of the Khrushchev-Castro trade and Norway's transport 9 percent. Turkish vessels carry another portion. All of them will go along.

But this is just a beginning toward execution of a policy which is namby-pamby at best. For example, we are denying U.S. government cargoes to ships of any country

used in trade between Cuba and the Communist bloc but these ships are free to pick up commercial cargoes anywhere they can find them.

Well, something in this case is better than nothing at all. Thus we urge Washington to use its best offices to get cooperation out of Greece, which supplies 25 percent of the total shipping, and Britain, which provides another 15 percent.

If there is to be no blockade of Communist Cuba and if the reclamation of Cuban soil by patriots is to be delayed, then these halting moves against shipping must be accepted as an alternative.

Before Castro had shown his colors plainly for all to see, Cuba exported \$223 million worth of goods a year to the United States and took \$357 million worth from this country.

It is no coincidence that Cuba's current trade with the Soviet Union almost equals these figures.

For another way, Cuba's longtime orientation toward the United States as an economic partner has now been switched to Russia.

This can go on only as long as the merchant fleets of the free world are made available for Cuban-Communist bloc trade. When there are no ships handy, the jig is up. Castro then has been isolated economically.

Representative PAUL ROGERS, who has helped keep the freeze on, thinks that Greece can be induced to cooperate. With West Germany and Norway doing their bit, the only missing character in the drama is Britain.

Our allies today are providing twice as much shipping for the Cuban Communist trade as the Communist bloc itself. It is strange, then, to hear the Economist of London chiding Americans for a mood of "furious impatience" over Cuba, especially in connection with the mild ship embargo.

Were Soviet Russia to establish a military base at Calais opposite the coast of England, it is likely that howls would go up from London.

Hitler did. History remembers that Britain had some help in flushing him out, too.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).